

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20. The allowance of claim 21 is noted with appreciation.

Examiner Hillery is thanked for the courteous interview conducted with Applicant's representative. The substance of that interview is set forth in the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102, on the basis of the article in Dr. Dobb's Portal entitled "PHP & Hosted Applications" by Ahmad Abualsamid, January 1, 2001 (identified in the Office Action as "Abualsamid"). This article relates to an electronic survey application hosted on a server and used by remote clients to survey end users, and more particularly the use of PHP 4 scripting language to create the survey [page 56, second column, third paragraph, to third column, line 2]. In contrast, the subject matter of the present application relates to the presentation of data that is requested from a displayed report. As discussed at the above-noted interview and further explained hereinafter, the Abualsamid article is directed to entirely disparate subject matter, and therefore cannot be interpreted to anticipate the rejected claims. Nevertheless, to advance the application to issue, new claim 22 is being substituted for rejected claim 22, to further clarify the distinctions over the reference.

Turning first to the Abualsamid reference, in a first step, a user who wishes to create a survey is prompted to enter a name of the survey (\$survey_name), a description of the survey (\$survey_description) and the total number of questions in the survey (\$survey_questions). This information is collected in a first form via Listing

One. A JavaScript validation function ensures that the user has entered all required data in an appropriate format. All of the form input elements of the first form are readily available as variables [page 58, column 2, line 2 to column 3, line 5] i.e. all the information of the first form is accessible in all PHP scripts invoked in that same session (i.e. creating a survey) [page 60, column 1, line 48 to column 2, line 1].

In a second step, step2.php of Listing Two is executed. Step2.php can access the variables \$survey_name, \$survey_description and \$survey_questions from the first form [page 58, column 3, line 5 to page 60, column 1, line 7]. These variables may thus be utilized directly in step2.php, for example as indicated in the for-loop in Listing Two. Step2.php enables the user to create a list of questions; the questions may be e.g. free text questions or multiple-choice questions [page 60, column 1, line 8 to page 60, column 1, line 29]. The for-loop generates one select statement and one text input for every question in the survey. The user creating the survey may specify the type of the question and the number of choices available per question [page 60, column 2, lines 39-43]. All form variables from the previous form (first form) appear immediately in the new script, step2.php [page 60, column 2, lines 32-33].

In a third step, step3.php of Listing Three is executed. In step3.php, two nested for-loops generate the form input elements needed to collect all the information of the survey. The outer for-loop generates form input elements for the text of each question and the inner for-loop generates form input elements for the text of each choice of each question. PHP 4 contains a feature enabling naming of variables holding text for multiple choice questions, a 2D array notation [page 60, column 2, line 44 to page 61, column 1, line 9].

Thus, by executing steps 1 through 3, a user may create a survey with a name, a description and a number of questions possibly comprising multiple choice answers, etc.

In a fourth step, Listing Four, a survey generated using steps 1-3 is inserted with an ID in a table called "Survey" in a MySQL database called "Surveys" [page 61, column 1, lines 22-45 and page 61, column 2, lines 21-33].

Once the survey has been inserted into the database (Listing Four), a user may take and complete the survey. Users key in the ID of the survey and the application performs a select statement against the database. A loop on the result set generates an HTML form with elements for each question. The form is submitted to a final PHP script that takes the answers and inserts them into an Answers table [page 61, column 2, lines 34-43].

The claimed invention, on the other hand, is directed to the ability to select a part of a graphical element in a data report, and have that part presented in another way, together with an additional part. For instance, a user may view a first graph representing, e.g., revenue for an organization comprising 10 shops vs. fiscal year. With a single click on the fiscal year axis of this graph, it is transformed into a second graph representing revenue of a particular shop vs. fiscal year. Alternatively or additionally, the user may have the first graph transformed into a third graph representing revenue per shop vs. shop # for fiscal year 2005 by a single click on the graph point (fiscal year = 2005, revenue in 2005) of the first graph.

Claim 22 recites a method of displaying a presentation that is requested from a data report that contains at least one graphical element that is bound to a first data item having associated metadata. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action states that

the survey form of the Abualsamid reference corresponds to the claimed data report. However, there is no disclosure in the reference that the form contains a graphical element that is bound to a data item, particularly one having associated metadata.

Claim 22 recites that the metadata comprises at least one of a measure representing an amount (e.g. sales revenue), a dimension along which measures can be arrayed (e.g. year), and a value for a dimension (e.g. 2005). In response to a user action directed to the graphical element displayed in the data report, the metadata associated with the data item is determined. If the determined metadata includes a dimension, a second data item is selected that comprises a measure, and an association between the two data items is created in the metadata of the first data item. Conversely, if the determined metadata includes a measure, a second data item is selected that comprises a dimension, and an association between the first and second data items is created in the metadata of the first data item.

Thus, the claim recites that a user action directed to a graphical element of the data report causes a determination to be made of the type of metadata associated with the corresponding data item, and the selection of another data item of a different type. This selection is followed by the creation of an association between the two data items in the metadata of the first item to which the user action was directed. It is respectfully submitted that the Abualsamid reference does not disclose this sequence of determining the type of metadata, selecting another data item if a different type, and creating an association between the two data items within the metadata of the first data item.

Claim 22 recites the further steps of searching a memory containing stored associations to identify a stored association that most closely matches the created

association, obtaining presentation properties that pertain to the identified stored association, and displaying a second data report in which the obtained presentation properties are applied to second data items that are specified in the stored association that was identified. Since the Abualsamid reference does not disclose the creation of an association as set forth in the claim, as noted previously, it cannot teach the further step of searching memory for an association that closely matches the created association.

Nor does it disclose the last two steps of the claim, namely obtaining presentation properties that pertain to a stored association that was identified as a result of the search, and displaying a second report by applying such display properties to second data items.

As discussed previously, the Abualsamid reference is directed to a concept that is entirely disparate from the claimed subject matter, namely the creation of an electronic survey application. It does not disclose how to present a second data report that is based upon the selection of a graphical element in a first data report that is bound to a data element. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is not anticipated by the reference.

For at least some of these same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 17 is likewise not anticipated. As such, claims 2-16 and 18-20, which depend from claims 22 and 17, respectively, likewise are not anticipated by the reference.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims, and allowance
of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 11, 2008

By: /jamesalabarre/
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620